



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/351,591	07/12/1999	TSUNEYOSHI TAKAGI	B569-008	9963
26272	7590	04/28/2004	EXAMINER	
ROBIN BLECKER & DALEY 2ND FLOOR 330 MADISON AVENUE NEW YORK, NY 10017			DIEP, NHON THANH	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2613	
DATE MAILED: 04/28/2004				

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/351,591	TAKAGI ET AL.
	Examiner Nhon T Diep	Art Unit 2613

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is FINAL.                            2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12,13 and 19 is/are pending in the application.
  - 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) 1-3,5-10,12,13 and 19 is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 12 July 1999 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \*    c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. ____.
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date ____.	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: ____.

## DETAILED ACTION

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 1-3, 5-10, 12, 13 and 19 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Kageyu (US 5,745,167), in view of Davis (US 5,963,666).

Kageyu discloses a video monitoring system comprising the same control apparatus capable of controlling a plurality of instrument (fig. 1, el. 1-2-1, 1-2-2, ..., 102-200), comprising a control right acquisition device for acquiring a control right to control an arbitrary instrument (camera) out of the plurality of instruments (cameras); and a control restriction device for restricting control of an instrument (camera), of which control right is not acquired, in accordance with control right information about the control right acquired by the control right acquisition device (figs. 19-20 and col. 13, ln. 50 – col. 14, ln. 63) as specified in claims 1, 6, 8, 12 and 19; the control right information includes information indicating at least three statuses: a status wherein no apparatus acquired the control right (col. 13, ln. 60-65), another status wherein another apparatus acquires the control right (the examiner interprets this as client A acquires the control right and client B does not acquire the control right; col. 14, ln. 5-7) and still another status wherein a self apparatus acquires the control right (the examiner interprets this as: client B acquires the control right and client A does not acquire the

control right; col. 14, ln. 5-7); and the control restriction device for restricting to controlling an instrument, on the basis of the control right information (col. 14, ln. 23-29) as specified in claims 2 and 9; the control restriction device invalidates a control command for controlling the plurality of instruments when another apparatus acquires the control right (col. 14, ln. 23-29) as specified in claims 3 and 10; a display device for displaying at least the control right information (fig. 1, el. 105-1, 105-2, 105-3) as specified in claims 5, 7 and 13. It is noted that Kageyu does not particularly disclose a plurality of instrument, which have specified function and move relatedly with mutual movements and a control restriction device for restricting control of **another** instrument (camera), of which control right is not acquired, in accordance with control right information about the control right acquired by the control right acquisition device as specified in claims 1, 6, 8, 12 and 19. Davis teaches, in the security sensor arrangement, at least two instruments used to detect an intruder, namely a video camera and an infrared sensor that must have overlapped field of view and may be used to support the operation of the other (Figs. 5-7, col. 6, ln. 37-65, col. 2, ln. 13-15). Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skilled in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the system of Kageyu by replacing regular video cameras with the combination of multiple sensing instruments as taught by Davis and that since the multiple sensing instruments must move relatedly or must maintain the overlapped field of views so that sensor signals can be further co-processed using data fusion techniques to determine whether one of a set of sensor interdependent predetermined conditions is matched (col. 2, ln. 29-32), it is a must that to obtain the

control of one instrument, one has to also obtain the control of the other instrument .

Doing so would help to improve the system of Kageyu by eliminating false alarms.

***Conclusion***

3. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Applicant's amendment necessitated the new ground(s) of rejection presented in this Office action. Accordingly, **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL**. See MPEP § 706.07(a). Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the date of this final action.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nhon T Diep whose telephone number is 703-305-4648. The examiner can normally be reached on m-f.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Chris S Kelley can be reached on 703 305-4856. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703 87209314.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is 703 305-2600.

ND  
1/12/2004

  
NHON DIEP  
PRIMARY EXAMINER